Grad
241
Dax / Mor
111059

THE

ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY

Town Hall, Bombay.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 19 September, 2016

MORALITY

ACCORDING TO THE

SACRAMENT OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

Cambridge:
PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A.
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

MORALITY

ACCORDING TO THE

SACRAMENT OF THE LORD'S SUPPER:

Three Discourses

ON THE NAMES

EUCHARIST, SACRIFICE, AND COMMUNION.

BY THE

REV. J. Ll: DAVIES, M.A.

RECTOR OF CHRIST CHURCH, ST MARYLEBONE.

London and Cambridge:
MACMILLAN AND CO.
1867.

[*All Rights reserved.*]

00111059

THESE Discourses were preached before the University of Cambridge on three Sundays in the January of this year. But in order to connect them more closely together as parts of a continuous exposition, I have omitted the texts and have otherwise slightly modified their form.

CONTENTS.

DISCOURSE I.

PAGE

THE EUCHARIST 1

DISCOURSE II.

SACRIFICE 31

DISCOURSE III.

COMMUNION 63

I.

THE EUCHARIST.

DISCOURSE I.

THE EUCHARIST.

In a recent volume of Essays, written to illustrate the political doctrines of the French philosopher M. Comte, one of the writers expresses his anticipation of the approaching downfall of Christianity in the following words: "Whatever a clergy may think, no religious organization can long hold its ground in popular esteem when confronted by a loftier morality than its own."[1] It is the Christian morality that is the less lofty. If it were only urged that the morality which it is the business of the clergy to teach is in some points defective or eccentric, such an opinion would not be unprecedented,

But it is a new thing that the Christian Faith should be condemned on account of the lower tone of its morality,—that the advocates of a system which claims to be absolutely universal, and which absolutely excludes and suppresses all belief in anything more Divine than the human race, should disdain to use the common language of unbelief, and instead of saying, "The Christian morality is beautiful and will live, but the Christian dogmas are contrary to reason and must perish," should confront Christianity with the boast, "The higher morality must prevail, and therefore the Christian Church is doomed." It is superfluous to repudiate in the name of the clergy the imputation that they are conscious of the inferiority of the Christian morality, and are depending upon some other force for the support of their creed. But it is awakening and useful to know that taunts like these have been addressed to us, and that Christians are challenged to let their faith be tried by the excellence of its proper morality.

It is a more familiar and less startling as-

sertion, that the Christian morality is not so vitally attached to the Christian creed that, if the creed is abandoned, the morality must wither. We may often see it earnestly and scientifically maintained, that an ethical system practically identical with the Christian law of duty may be based upon the experience of what promotes the happiness of mankind, and that the sense of what is good for mankind will be found an adequate motive without any other for the observance of this system.

At the same time that systems of morality are thus offered to us, which own no allegiance whatever to a belief in Christ or in God, and which profess to be either loftier in tone or in more exact accordance with facts than Christian morality, there is a well-known tendency now prevailing to cultivate in the Church a religion more mystical, making its appeal more exclusively to the peculiar religious and devotional instincts, and in this sense less moral, less rational, than our English religion has commonly professed to be.

To all who feel the gravity of the divorce so threatened from both sides between devotional religion and every-day morality,—to those especially who retain the old Christian and English persuasion, that our faith in Christ is still the deepest and surest basis of a universal morality, and that a religion which does not willingly accept the moral life of men in general as its proper sphere and criterion is likely to become a superstition, with all the baneful influences which superstition has proved itself powerful to exert,—I venture to commend the subject on which I am about to enter in these discourses. I ask you to reflect upon the *moral aspects of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.* In that Sacrament we have a rite which contains by universal agreement the very heart of our ritual religion. It is our most honoured ordinance; it holds the key of all our secrets. It is the crowning act of our worship throughout Christendom, everywhere performed with most reverence, looked forward to with most awe, wearing to the common mind the most sacred

investiture of associations. Those who are now seeking to revive amongst us a disused policy of working upon the religious affections make it their chief aim to heighten the mystery and solemnity of this rite. Let us inquire then what natural connexions there are between this the most religious act of our religion and the principles of universal human life. And let us be guided in our inquiry by three names applied to this Sacrament, Eucharist, Sacrifice, and Communion.

The first of these names, the Eucharist, a name scarcely familiar to the childhood of the present generation, has been brought into use of late years by those who have desired that this Sacrament should be regarded with a deeper awe. It is a venerable ecclesiastical *name*; but, if its significance be considered, it is one which might be accepted without distaste by the most ultra-Protestant. What Christian is there, even amongst Puritans or Rationalists, who would not gladly call the celebration of the Lord's Supper an act of Thanksgiving? In its most

unmystical character as a bare commemoration, this Sacrament cannot be anything less than our great Thanksgiving Service. But those to whom the Sacrament is mystical and awful are not inconsistent in bearing witness that the highest possible act of human worship is well designated a Thanksgiving. They are not betraying their principle when they delight to call our participation in the Body and Blood of Christ the Holy Thanksgiving. They may be understood to affirm in this way that in Christian thankfulness there is a mystery which passes all understanding. And assuredly, whether the most sacred language of the Communion Office be considered, or the doctrine of the Apostles as to the inner nature of the Christian life, the name of the Eucharist will commend itself as one of peculiar dignity and significance.

Can any one who thinks what words mean read without wonder that saying of St. Paul's, "Giving thanks always for all things unto God and the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ"? He has been speaking of the

high privileges of Christians, bidding his readers think of themselves as God's beloved children and as enlightened with the Divine light of Christ, and he claims that their life should be a life of joy, of inspiration, of thankfulness. "Be filled with the Spirit; speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord, giving thanks always for all things unto God and the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ." Other and various affections will be excited by varying circumstances; but throughout all circumstances alike the basis of the Christian life should be eucharistical. To what a depth in the human heart must the spirit of thankfulness reach, to make such a condition possible! The writings of St. Paul are everywhere full of evidences that he, for one, recognized the law of abiding thankfulness as practically binding upon himself and his fellow-Christians. Thus he says to the Thessalonians, "Rejoice evermore: pray without ceasing: *in everything give thanks; for this is the will of God*

in Christ Jesus concerning you." And there is a remarkable passage (2 Cor. viii. ix.) in which St. Paul lingers over the double subject of grace and gratitude, ringing changes in his characteristic manner upon the word χάρις in its various senses of favour, bounty, and thankfulness, and winds up with what may possibly be a primitive liturgical formula, "Thanks be to God for his unspeakable gift!"—an utterance not the less impressive as a testimony to the law of thankfulness, because it is uncertain whether by that gift we are to understand God's grace, or the Gospel, or the Saviour himself, the Son whom the Father gave for the redemption of mankind.

In the Holy Eucharist this principle of thankfulness has had from the first its peculiar witness and expression. The Jewish Passover to which it succeeded was itself a Eucharist. When Jesus kept it for the last time with his disciples, he gave thanks, or blessed, before the distribution of the bread, and again before the giving of the cup. In so doing he was observing the common custom, according to which the

Paschal feast was celebrated with the chanting of the special Eucharistic Psalms, and every act of it accompanied by some formula of thanksgiving. The thankfulness of the Paschal feast was handed on to the Lord's Supper of the Christian Church, only gaining depth and intensity from the new occasions of thankfulness which were found in the broken Body and the poured-out Blood. The Christians delighted to call their most solemn rite the Εὐχαριστία or the Εὐλογία, the Thanksgiving, or the Blessing. These titles were not regarded as accidental names, but as giving welcome expression to the true significance and spirit of the ordinance. Thus St. Chrysostom, whilst he speaks of the sacramental celebrations as "awful mysteries, fraught with much salvation," explains that the service is called "the Thanksgiving, because it is a remembrance of many benefits, and shews forth the crowning act of God's regard, and prepares us to be perpetually thankful."[2] In exact harmony with these words is the Exhortation addressed by the Priest in our English

office to those who are about to communicate. "*Above all things*," he is bidden to say, "ye must give most humble and hearty *thanks* to God." "To the end that we should alway remember the exceeding great love of our Master and only Saviour Jesus Christ thus dying for us, and the innumerable benefits which by his precious bloodshedding he hath obtained to us; he hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as pledges of his love, and for a continual remembrance of his death, to our great and endless comfort. To him therefore, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, let us give, as we are most bounden, continual thanks." And, as the service proceeds, it is evidently the chief aim of the forms of this office to animate to the very utmost the Eucharistical spirit. The redeeming love of the Father, the tenderness of Christ, the assured forgiveness of God, are declared in comfortable words; the duty and reasonableness of being thankful are urged; and the worshippers are drawn on by the inspiring contagion of example and voice, and as it were

compelled to give thanks. The Priest says "Lift up your hearts," and the people answer "We lift them up unto the Lord;" again he calls on them, "Let us give thanks unto our Lord God," and again they assent, "It is meet and right so to do;" and then he turns to the Lord's table, and speaking to God in the name of the people confesses, "It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times and in all places give thanks unto thee, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting God;" and so begins to lead that greatest choral thanksgiving of the Universal Church, "Therefore with angels and archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious name; evermore praising thee, and saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts, heaven and earth are full of thy glory: Glory be to thee, O Lord most high." When the Bread is given, and again when the Cup is given, the communicant is bidden to be thankful; the Prayer which follows the reception, in either of its alternative forms, begins with thanksgiving,

and the office concludes with the *Gloria in excelsis*, in which the eucharistical spirit seems to strive with the inadequacy of human words in the utterance of gratitude and praise.

Whilst we observe so manifest a desire to make the Holy Eucharist really a Eucharist, we see also that the office itself repeatedly declares that the thankfulness of the Christian cannot be limited to a service, but must be diffused through the whole life. At all times and in all places it is our duty to give thanks. The Eucharist bears witness to this duty in its fulness. The benefits for which we give thanks are not temporary or local. He whom we thank is one to whom we may have access whenever and wherever we will. Our gratitude to God rests upon a sense of His goodness to us, joined with the consciousness of our own unworthiness. God is good to us: but *how* good is He? The Holy Eucharist replies, that God *so* loved us as to give his Son in our flesh and blood to die for us, and this, whilst we were yet sinners. No other account of God's love can equal this mea-

sure of it; and the Sacrament of the Eucharist helps us against our own carelessness and forgetfulness to realize it. But if we ask, *When* is God good to us?—the Eucharistic answer is, *Always*. He to whom we give thanks for the gift of his Son is the Eternal Maker, the Ruler of the world and of our destinies. We are his creatures; we can assert no independence in His sight. "What hast thou which thou didst not receive?" The relation between God and men revealed to us in Christ,—that spiritual sonship to which we cannot be conformed without spiritual discipline,—enables us to understand how God, the giver of all pleasant things, may be still good in withholding or taking away pleasant things. And thus the true disciple of the Eucharist learns a thankfulness which confesses God's greatest benefit only that it may recognize all things as benefits. Contemplating the glory of the Cross, he beholds a glory of which heaven and earth are full. Thankfulness for Christ is as a reservoir from which all the fields of human life are watered.

Has thankfulness to God, supposing that it thus belongs to the atmosphere of the Lord's Supper, any moral value in human life?

I do not ask the question merely for the purposes of controversy. At the same time let it be remembered that those who frame any complete scheme of duty or morality without taking account of God have no place for this thankfulness in their estimate of moral forces. But those who affirm most strongly our dependence upon God may find benefit, I hope, from a recollection of some of the salutary influences which human life owes to the spirit of thankfulness.

1. Let me name first the power of thankfulness to make the thankful person *happy*. Thankfulness is inseparably associated with joy; all the terms of gladness and delight lend themselves naturally to thanksgiving. "O praise the Lord; for it is a good thing to sing praises unto our God, yea a joyful and pleasant thing it is to be thankful." This is a truth of nature, capable of infinite illustration, but so certainly commend-

ing itself as to need none. What I would especially ask you to think of is the immense power which belongs to thankfulness, as the true "spirit of delight," if only it become deep and earnest enough, to diffuse and secure happiness amongst men. Make all men thankful, and you have made the world a happy world. The gratitude which is occasional and temporary will easily evaporate indeed in superficial emotions. But imagine such thankfulness as St. Paul believed in, and such as the Eucharist hallows, to be lodged in a man's heart; who can doubt the power of it? The only question must be whether to a man with open eyes such a thankfulness is possible; and I do not speak without remembering how much there is to persuade us that it is only a dream. No doubt the perfect Christian thankfulness is ideal, and has never been more than imperfectly realized; but it has surely proved itself in the experience of the truest and best of men, and daily proves itself, to be no mere fiction of an excited brain. Men *have* given God thanks with a sincere inward

joy out of fires and dungeons of tribulation. We cannot doubt "that some have striven Achieving calm, to whom was given The joy that mixes man with heaven:" and we may claim to be reasonable and practical, when we recognize in thankfulness, according to its depth and intensity, a power to make men happy with a happiness which has no drawback. Who can point to a higher or sweeter or more enviable bliss than that which may be seen to radiate from the face of a sufferer, who has learnt to trust in God's love with an unreserved faith and to give thanks even for afflictions?

2. Thankfulness to God is also a genial, kindly, social feeling. There is indeed a bastard thankfulness which tends to isolation and selfishness, that of the Pharisee who said with himself, "God, I thank thee that I am not as other men are." But the fault of this is simply that it is not thankfulness. It is self-complacency, borrowing the mere form and phrase of thanksgiving. True thankfulness is sure to postpone and depreciate self; and it therefore

tends proportionably to promote good feeling and kindly intercourse amongst men. For that which mars fellowship is the assertion of self; it is vanity, jealousy, covetousness, or some other form of self-love. You see a man with whom you cannot hope to get on pleasantly; he may seem hard, or exacting, or irritable, or absorbed in his own schemes, or brooding over his own feelings; but he will certainly not be one in whom the Eucharistic disposition predominates. If vulgarity repels, there is nothing more essentially opposed to vulgarity than a pure and deep thankfulness. We call the benevolent instincts social; but there are many to whom the companionship of a simply thankful person would be more attractive than that of one endowed with an obvious and patent benevolence. We have but to name the synonymous forms of grace, gracious, graciousness, and we read in the common language of mankind a testimony to the power of thankfulness to make men agreeable to one another and to render their mutual intercourse delightful.

3. Again, the thankful spirit guides and encourages *purity.*

It does so, because it takes everything *as a gift from God.* It grasps at nothing; it respects with a natural submission the ordinances of the Creator. Whenever "this is forbidden" is marked upon any indulgence within a man's reach, the thankful spirit willingly renounces it, knowing no such thing as a sense of injury in matters between God and the soul, believing that God in commanding us to abstain is doing us no less a benefit than if He bade us receive, and turning with simplicity and contentment to the enjoyment of what He gives.

St. Paul shews incidentally, in more than one place, with what confidence he was accustomed to depend on the principle of thankfulness to God as a moral safeguard. "The earth is the Lord's," he says, "and the fulness thereof." Nothing, therefore, is to be shunned or dreaded as in itself evil; the Christian is free to take or not as it may be advantageous for himself and his brethren. "For," argues St. Paul, "if I partake

with thankfulness, why am I evil spoken of for that for which I give thanks?" He seems to assume that a man cannot well be doing wrong if in eating or in not eating he is thankful to God and keeps His glory in view. And again he warns Timothy against those who forbid to marry and command to abstain from meats, "which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving by them who believe and know the truth. For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving." St. Paul did not mean, of course, that laws and ordinances were abolished for the Christian, and that he could make any indulgence lawful by adding to it an act of thanksgiving. He assumed that the spirit of thankfulness would dispose a man to study and inquire what the will of the Lord is, and compel him to obey that will cheerfully when he knows it. And might he not make that assumption safely? Let a man try to be thankful for something which he knows in his conscience to be illegitimate, for dissipation which wastes his time and

weakens his moral if not his bodily strength, for an advantage won unfairly at the expense of a neighbour, for increase of wealth to which he is selling his soul, even for a thing which is innocent except that he cares too much about it,—and he will learn by the contradiction which will rise within him what a spear of Ithuriel he possesses in thankfulness, and how impossible it is for the thankful heart to be other than temperate and pure.

4. And whilst we might be guarded from evil as that which is displeasing to God, so we might be made more receptive and appreciative towards all good, by the same temper of thankfulness to the gracious and bountiful Father. Much is lost,—who can say how much?—especially of the finest and most spiritual influences which move in the atmosphere of the world, through the indifference and insensibility of selfish natures. It is one of the happy effects of a continual thankfulness, that it opens the character, like a warm and genial climate, and makes it tenderer and more susceptible to such

influences. If we are daily thanking God for the gift, above all, of His Son, and of the Spirit of His Son, we shall be so turned to what is most Divine, that all that is God-like, all that is loving and healthful and pure, will be welcome to us and give us pleasure. Our sympathies will be refined, and we shall be the richer, and the world will be the richer, through our thankfulness.

5. Again, it is worth while to observe briefly the power which thankfulness has to sustain and adjust other virtues. Let us take two instances.

Humility and a just self-esteem have some appearance of being contradictory the one to the other. It is a Christian excellence to be humble: "in lowliness of mind," says the Apostle, "let each esteem other better than themselves." But truth would have a man think of himself as neither better nor worse than he is; and we know how advantageous a noble pride is in preserving men from what is mean and unworthy. Now the thankful Christian says,

"By the grace of God I am what I am;" but he can also add, "By my own fault I am what I am." It will be his continual desire to refer all that is good in him to God, and therefore on fitting occasions to do justice to it, and to refer all that is unworthy in him to himself, and therefore always to humble himself on account of it. Thus it is quite possible for a man to think both highly and lowly concerning himself: pride and humility are both justified by thankfulness.

Liberality in the use of money finds a great help in thankfulness. The lines of our childhood "Not more than others I deserve, But God has given me more," express a conviction which can hardly fail to make and keep a man liberal. Can I thank God, as one whom God has blessed beyond any deservings of his own, for what He has given me, and not be ready—more ready than those whose only view of their possessions is that they have acquired or inherited them—to do whatever may be best with my money for the good of my neighbours and

my brethren? And there will be a *grace* (the word is again a testimony) in the liberality of a thankful person, which is less likely to adorn and sweeten that of a calculating benevolence.

6. Lastly, the principle of thankfulness has a marked value in the sphere of the political relations of human societies.

It is a familiar practice of rulers and statesmen to appoint Days of Thanksgiving for events which the people recognize as good for the land. This is done in countries which have not the convenience of a single State Church, as well as in our own and in the old Roman Catholic countries. There are cases in which, as in Switzerland, the existing settlement of the constitution is commemorated by a yearly Thanksgiving-Sunday. No doubt the religious feelings of the population have demanded this kind of observance; but statesmen from their point of view have seen its utility. It is impossible to imagine a more valuable political sentiment in a country than that of a reverent thankfulness to God for all that is good in its history and

constitution. To cling to what has come down from the past with a blind superstition; to treat with a careless levity historical institutions, as if any generation could unmake and make at will its own political system:—each of these habits is feared and deprecated by all wise citizens. We are armed against both, when we thank God under whose good Providence our fathers lived and wrought, and to whose present help and guidance we ourselves may equally appeal. But the most immediate and valued effect of national thanksgivings is to bind the population together in one brotherly feeling. By the joy of common thankfulness families and classes are spiritually welded together; a love for the common inheritance, fellow-feeling amongst all who share it, are naturally cherished. The words of the Hebrew patriot can yet find an echo in all loyal hearts, "Jerusalem is built as a city that is at unity in itself. For thither the tribes go up, even the tribes of the Lord, to testify unto Israel, to give thanks unto the name of the Lord."

These are some of the illustrations which have occurred to me as shewing the moral value of the Eucharistical principle in human life. You may have hardly needed them to deepen your conviction that those who banish thankfulness to God by recognizing no God to be thanked, are expelling the very juice and sap from morality, and robbing life of some of its finest bloom. But we all have abundant need to be reminded how much we lose by not conforming ourselves to the spirit of our holiest mysteries. The Eucharist, we have seen, does not separate itself from secular life. It demands for its own celebration a feeling which can only be brought to it by those who are habitually thankful; it seeks to raise that feeling to its highest power, and to send it pulsing again through our daily experience. Our whole worship, rightly understood, is in harmony with the service in which it culminates, and would spread and preserve the same influence. All our prayers are to be accompanied with thanksgiving,—nay, must rest on thanksgiving as their basis.

For thankfulness, whilst it can make no claim to be exempt from the logical difficulties which are more usually urged against prayer, is deeper than prayer. Our hope that God will hear us depends on what God has done for us. "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all,—how shall he not with Him also freely give us all things?" Day by day, Sunday after Sunday, we utter words of gratitude and praise for all that God has done for us. Are we not unfaithful Christians, untrue to the privileges of our creed and our worship, in that we do not carry about with us hearts more steadfastly thankful? We are encompassed,—you that are yet living here under the shadow of ancient learning and piety, no less, assuredly, than those of us whose lot is cast elsewhere,—by blessings old and new. These will become dearer and more helpful to us as we thank God for them all,

> From the gift looking to the Giver,
> And from the cistern to the River,
> And from the finite to Infinity,
> And from man's dust to God's Divinity.

II.

SACRIFICË.

DISCOURSE II.

SACRIFICE.

IN speaking of the word *Sacrifice* as one of the titles of the Lord's Supper, we encounter a difficulty which did not present itself to us in considering the significance of the word Eucharist. A large proportion of English Christians are not indeed in the habit of using the former term, the Holy Eucharist, when they have occasion to mention this Sacrament. But this is simply a matter of custom. If the meaning of the word is borne in mind, it cannot possibly be regarded by any Christian as objectionable, on doctrinal grounds that the Lord's Supper should be designated as our Thanksgiving-Service. *The*

Holy Sacrifice is not a title that would be accepted with equal acquiescence. I am aware that many would repudiate and condemn it as implying doctrine which our own Church has disclaimed. But it cannot be denied that in using our Communion Office we find a prominent place given to the idea and the name of sacrifice. And, in speaking of the connexion which properly subsists between the most sacred Christian ordinance and common morality, I prefer to contemplate this Sacrament from the point of view of those to whom it is most awful and furthest removed from the associations and conditions of ordinary life: as on the other hand it belongs to my purpose to keep in view the secular systems of morality in which a theory of human virtue is constructed without taking any account of God. And the word Sacrifice seems to me peculiarly valuable and instructive, as linking the deepest faith and highest worship of the Christian with the principles of every-day duty.

This word may be claimed, no doubt, by

Roman Catholics and by those who approximate closely to Roman Catholics as fitly expressing what takes place according to their belief when the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is celebrated. They have, they would say, at their altar the two essential elements of a sacrifice—the *hostia* or victim, and the sacrificing priest. To the inquiry "Where is the lamb for a burnt-offering?" it is answered that the priest has the power to call down the Lamb of God from heaven, and that after the act of consecration the Lord Jesus Christ is present as a sacrificial victim under the outward form of bread, or of bread and wine. But such a sacrifice is professedly of the nature of a *fleshly* sacrifice; this is its boast. And if we were able to accept those assertions, it would still be open to us, and surely incumbent on us as Christians, to inquire what is the essentially *spiritual* sacrifice of which that in the flesh is the instrument or exponent. All sacrifices are acceptable to God just in proportion as they are spiritual. The spirit is to beware, it is true, of repudiating the flesh as evil

or insignificant; but the spirit is always higher than the flesh, even were it the flesh of the Son of God Himself.

It is worth while, perhaps, to apply this observation at the present time to all theories as to the mode of the Real Presence, or as it is sometimes called, the Real Objective Presence, of Christ in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. I do not wish to advocate or to oppose any definition upon this subject. It is far easier to contend with words about the nature of that Presence, than to be sure that we understand either our own words or those of our opponents. And the line of thought which I have suggested may be followed, I hope, by Christians who are not all willing to use the same language on the controverted question of the Real Presence. But all who hold any opinions whatever as to the relation between the Body and Blood of Christ and the consecrated elements may be reminded with advantage of what all must equally admit, —I mean, the natural superiority of that which is spiritual over that which is corporeal.

It is often assumed that in proportion as men approximate in opinion to the doctrine of the Church of Rome, called Transubstantiation, in that proportion the Presence in the Sacrament becomes more truly awful. And this is taken for granted on both sides; it is conceded as well as claimed. "If it were only true," it is said, "that Christ is really present on the altar, no homage could possibly be too profound for that Divine Presence, no dress could be too rich or ornaments too costly for those who approach it, no prostrations before it too humble." The awful effect of the corporeal or quasi-corporeal presence is not the matter commonly disputed, nor the kind of reverence it would demand; one side affirms, "Christ *is* thus present," the other side replies, "He is not, or not in the awful manner you suppose." But take the extreme case, as including all other opinions that in any degree approach it; suppose all that the most advanced Romanist has ever put forward as to the Bodily Presence of Christ in the Sacrament to be true. Is Christ infinitely more worthy of

our reverence when presented to us under some bodily form, than when He is not under a form of which our senses can take cognizance?

The awfulness and dignity of the Sacramental host can hardly be greater than would belong to the visible human form of Jesus Christ, such as the eyes of the Apostles saw and their hands handled at Jerusalem or in Galilee. If the Lord Jesus were thus to manifest himself amongst us, who would turn from that form to worship with a deeper reverence the bread or the wafer of the Sacrament? But we do not gather from the New Testament that the Christ visible in the flesh upon the earth was worshipped by His disciples with a more adoring homage than the Christ at the Father's right hand in heaven. The Apostles did not feel after the day of Pentecost that their God was lost to them. It is undeniable, on the contrary, that they then worshipped Christ with a more assured faith, that they rejoiced in Him with a deeper joy, than when He had been going in and out amongst them. Their Master had pre-

pared them for this advance in Spiritual apprehension. He told them that He must depart in order that the Spirit might come to them, and that when the Spirit came He would be with them again in a far more satisfying manner. "I will not leave you bereaved, I will come to you. Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more; but ye see me: because I live, ye shall live also. At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you." The Apostles undoubtedly believed that these promises were fulfilled; it was their settled conviction that the Spirit had infinitely more power in enabling them to have fellowship with Christ than any bodily presence.

It may be said that what makes the Bodily Presence in the Sacrament so much more awful than Christ's spiritual presence is that it is brought to the altar by a miracle. But a miracle is treated by our Lord Himself as a condescension to the senses, which it is not creditable to faith to require; and a miracle which, like Transubstantiation, makes no appeal to the

senses is without even that lower virtue of a miracle. If the Apostles would have felt that they were descending to a lower spiritual level in craving for the renewed presence of Jesus as He had been before His death, it is hardly likely that their deepest reverence would have been stirred by seeing Him in bodily presence under the form of a wafer.

Whether therefore the Bread and the Wine are miraculously changed in any manner or degree into the Body and Blood of Christ, or are made to represent the Body and the Blood without any alteration of their substance, it is equally important that the worshippers should not make more of the flesh than of the spirit, and that they should strive to realize above all in the Spirit the spiritual presence of God. Christ local upon the altar or in the priest's hand is not so awful, not so essentially Divine, as Christ in us. If our spirits are to acknowledge their true Lord and Deliverer, they must look, not into the priest's hand, but upwards to the eternal throne. If they are to be pene-

trated by the deepest and most sanctifying awe, they must learn something of the meaning of those words, "At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you."

This truth should especially be borne in mind when we are considering the moral aspect of the Lord's Supper in the light of the idea of Sacrifice. For Sacrifice, as I have said, can only be acceptable to God in so far as it is spiritual. It makes no difference whether the oblation be of an animal's life, or of devotion and good works; what God regards is always the spirit that offers it. The Sacrifice of the Son of God was infinitely precious because he offered Himself through the Eternal Spirit to the Father.

I have referred to the repugnance felt by many in our own Church to the use of the word Sacrifice as a title of the Lord's Supper. This repugnance has much to justify it, but we find less reason for cherishing it when we perceive how customary it was amongst the early Fathers of the Church to call the Lord's Supper a Sacrifice, before the doctrine of Transubstantiation

was received, and without implying anything like that doctrine. There are two words continually associated with sacrifice in their writings; one of them is "remembrance," the other is "rational," the former taken from our Lord's saying, "Do this in remembrance of me," the latter from St. Paul's expression (Romans xii. 1), "Which is your reasonable or rational service." Thus the Lord's Supper is called "the remembrance of the sacrifice once offered;" it is said that Christ "handed down to us *a memory* to offer by way of a sacrifice continually to God;"[3] and St. Chrysostom thus corrects himself, "Our sacrifice is one; we do not vary it, but always offer the same, *or rather*, we celebrate a *remembrance* of a sacrifice."[4] And that epithet of St. Paul's, rational, λογικήν, is very commonly joined with sacrifice, implying that the sacrifice or worship is an act of the mind or understanding. And the same idea is conveyed by similar terms, which describe the Christian sacrifice as not corporeal but belonging to the region of the thoughts and the affections.[5] Let me quote two sentences

in which this idea is expressed: "We offer our own souls in sacrifice, and present them to God, by dying to the world and to a fleshly mind."[6] "Our victim is above, our priest above, our sacrifice above. Therefore let us offer such sacrifices as can be presented on that altar."[7]

In accordance with this venerable language, we observe that the idea of sacrifice enters in a two-fold manner into the celebration of the Lord's Supper. (1) We remember and plead and as it were present anew the Sacrifice of Christ once made for men, (2) and we come to offer sacrifices of our own.

The Sacrifice of Christ was consummated in His death, by the breaking of His body and the shedding of His blood. It was precisely this that the Sacrament was instituted to set forth. Jesus said "Do this in remembrance of me; in remembrance of me as giving my body and pouring out my blood for you." The whole sacramental ceremony has reference to this death of Christ. When we call Christ's death a Sacrifice, we mean that He

offered Himself through death to the Father. The Prayer of Consecration in our Office begins by pleading this Sacrifice. It appeals to the Father as having Himself originated the Sacrifice, and calls upon Him by His own tender mercy shewn in this act. "Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption; who made there by His own oblation of Himself once offered a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world;... hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee."—A very earnest expression of what was taught by our Lord and by His Apostles concerning His Sacrifice. It was the Father who sent the Son to die for us, who purchased to Himself a universal Church by the precious blood of His dear Son. The Son surrendered Himself willingly to the Father's will. "Lo I come,"—this was the principle of His sacrifice,—"to do thy will, O God." His whole life in the flesh therefore was a part of his self-oblation;

but the offering culminated, when He gave Himself up in the agonies of the Passion and the darkness of death and the grave. This offering, the Church rejoices to believe, was perfect. When the Son, in obedience to the Father's will, had offered Himself in human flesh through suffering and death to His Father, nothing further was wanted to open the way completely for humanity to the heart of God. The Father was perfectly well pleased in the Son, who was the head of our sinful race. The Son took upon Himself the sins of His brethren, and in His Person human sin was brought into contact with the Divine forgiveness, and was swallowed up by it. We remember in our Sacrament the Offering which was thus perfect and precious; we re-enact in a manner that Sacrifice; we present it by the lifting up of our minds and spirits, as the demonstration of His own love and as the response of the Son's love, to our Father in heaven. The Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ was instituted and made perpetual, in order that the redeeming Death of

Christ might be thus set continually in reconciling power between God and our sinful souls.

This is, it is plain, an eminently religious rite, full of what it pleases many to call dogma. Has it anything directly to do with the moral activity of human life?—The word Sacrifice has another application in the Sacrament, as we have seen, besides its reference to the Self-oblation of Christ. If Christ gave Himself for us, it belongs to us to give ourselves with Him. If He opened a way for us to the Father, it is our part to approach God by it. If Christ made Himself a Sacrifice, we ought to make ourselves sacrifices.

I have reminded you how the Prayer which precedes the partaking of the Bread and the Wine appeals to the Father in the name of the Divine Sacrifice. Let me quote now a part of the Prayer which follows the communicating: "Here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee.....And although we be unworthy, through our manifold

sins, to offer unto Thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech Thee to accept this our bounden duty and service; not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences, through Jesus Christ our Lord." It is assumed that we cannot realize the sacrifice of Christ—that we cannot cry for help to God as the Father who gave His Son and to whom the Son offered Himself—that we cannot feed upon His self-oblation — without being drawn to offer ourselves like Him to God, in order that His will and nothing else may be done by us. Christ is laid as a foundation, in order that we may build, or be built up, upon it. "To whom coming," says St. Peter, "as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God and precious, ye also, as living stones, are being built up, a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." Similarly, St. Paul says, "Be ye therefore followers, or imitators, of God, as dear children; and walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given Himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice

to God for a sweet-smelling savour." And again, "I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself for me." But it is needless to multiply passages to prove how natural and necessary it seemed to the Apostles that those who believed that Christ had offered Himself in their behalf to the Father's will, should consecrate themselves as sacrifices to the same will.

What is the meaning for us of our presenting ourselves, souls and bodies, as living sacrifices to God? Sacrifice is sometimes spoken of as equivalent to self-denial. It involves self-denial, no doubt, but it is more than equivalent to it. It assumes a living Will, at whose disposal we place ourselves: and the reality and the character of that Will become, when Sacrifice is in question, supremely important. We believe in a God who wills; we believe that He is perfectly good,—just, merciful, true, and that therefore His will chooses all that is good; we

believe that the living God, who is all-good, governs the universe and adjusts the place of each one of us in an order of which He is the maker; we believe that God has made His will known in manifesting His Son, and that we may learn its principles in the life of Jesus Christ; we believe that we are intended to discover what God's will is in particular cases by trying to do what is right, and by studying the effect of our actions. We further believe that God loves us, and has called us to sonship in His Son, and desires us to trust in Him as children trust in a Father. In this faith we are exhorted to make ourselves sacrifices to God. We are taught to fix our eyes on a Deliverer who has conquered sin and death for us, and has reappeared out of the darkness and mystery of the grave. We have the promise of a Spirit of Sacrifice from above, which is the perfect filial Spirit, the Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son.

Thus to give ourselves up in the faith of Christians involves an utter subjection and sur-

render of our own wills. The law of this subjection is as inexorable as those who speak of the danger of such a belief can represent it to be. To the thorough Christian neither his own will nor the wills or opinions of any number of men can count as anything compared with the will of God. He owns it as his duty not to be conformed to this world, but to be transformed by the renewing of his mind, that he may prove by experience what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God. But, if the character in which he knows God is that of the Father of men and the maker and sustainer of the world's order, if he is continually thanking God for having so loved the world as to give His Son that the world might be saved, if his earnest hope is always for a glory of God which is identified with the well-being of the human race, no sacrifice of himself to the will of God is possible which is not also an offering of himself for the real good of mankind. There is a sentence in which St. Paul sums up the life of King David, which may be

translated in two different ways. St. Paul says, that David fell asleep *after he had served his own generation by the will of God*, or *after he had in his own generation served the will of God.* The conduct described by either translation is in the eye of Christian faith identical. It will make no difference to us whether we propose to serve our generation by the will of God, or to serve the will of God in our generation. We do the best service we can to our fellow-men when we are most obedient to God's will; we please God best when we serve our fellow-men most zealously.

And again, it follows from our Christian premisses that the most unreserved offering up of ourselves to the will of God results not in our slavery but in our emancipation. The service of God, as we thankfully acknowledge, is perfect freedom. To be ruled by self or by the world, this is slavery. To submit willingly, with the concurrence of our knowlege and judgment, to the will of our Maker and Father, or, in other words, to the source of all the

order and beauty and happiness of the universe, is to inherit our proper freedom. And therefore Sacrifice to God is to be looked upon, not with dread as a painful necessity, but with joy and hope and longing.

Self-denial is recognized without stint in the prevailing non-theistical systems of morality. It is an ignorant slander to reproach the utilitarian ethics of Mr. Mill, for example, or the positivist ethics of M. Comte, with pandering to selfishness. In both these systems benevolence and self-sacrifice are as strongly and sincerely advocated as they can be by Christian moralists. Indeed in both, the rule of duty, as between a man and other men, is hardly distinguishable from the Christian rule. Mr. Mill thus protests on behalf of his system: "Let utilitarians never cease to claim the morality of self-devotion as a possession which belongs by as good a right to them, as either to the Stoic or to the Transcendentalist. The utilitarian morality does recognize in human beings the power of sacrificing their own greatest good for the good of others...

The happiness which forms the utilitarian standard of what is right in conduct, is not the agent's own happiness, but that of all concerned. As between his own happiness and that of others, utilitarianism requires him to be as strictly impartial as a disinterested and benevolent spectator. In the golden rule of Jesus of Nazareth, we read the complete spirit of the ethics of utility. To do as one would be done by, and to love one's neighbour as oneself, constitute the ideal perfection of utilitarian morality."[8] M. Comte avoids that adoption of "happiness" as an ultimate standard and quantitative measure of right and wrong which seems to excite an instinctive repugnance in minds trained in the Christian school, and treats the inherent superiority of the benevolent sentiments as a principle determined by the necessary conditions of human progress[9]. He, as is well known, has sought to give to the serving of humanity all the characteristics of a religion, and no one can complain of any coldness or want of enthusiasm in M. Comte's own

devotion. A third kind of philosophy, commonly spoken of as Pantheistic, of which M. Renan may be taken as an exponent, holds that "for simple natures absolute devotion is the most exquisite of enjoyments and a kind of want;" that "it is a luxury to man to suffer for anything;" and that "if humanity were raised to ten times its present height, man would be so completely disengaged from selfishness that he would be plunged in a perpetual adoration of the true, the good, and the beautiful, rolling from one ecstasy into another, living and dying in a torrent of pleasure."[10]

What have we to say then, when we compare the moral teaching of our Christian Sacrament as to sacrifice with the morality of those to whom this Sacrament is obsolete?—Not, certainly, that *we* believe in devotion, and *they* in self-love. But this, I think,—that we believe in a Fatherly Providence, greater than humanity, to which we may offer and entrust ourselves, and in a Divine Head who has gone before us and whom we may follow, and in a Spirit which has

a higher and more abiding source than either the clearest conviction or the most exquisite sentiment in ourselves. To us *a Gospel* has been preached, a Gospel which is enshrined for ever in the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood. According to our experience, humanity is weak, open to the noblest inspirations, capable of heroic actions, but liable to fall, perpetually tempted by selfishness and cowardice, wanting something stronger than itself to cling to and lean upon. It seems hard upon such a nature to say to a man, "You are bound to sacrifice absolutely and for ever your own highest good if such a sacrifice can produce a greater quantity of good elsewhere." We cannot think it an ignoble instinct to shrink from loss, ruin, annihilation. We believe that the sacrifice is not less perfect because faith can say, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit:" we have no fear of a more refined and disguised form of self-love being encouraged by the exhortation, "Let them that suffer according to the will of God commit the keeping of their souls to Him

in well-doing, as unto a faithful Creator." We rejoice therefore that there is One who knows us and cares for us and will take charge of us, and that He permits us to dedicate ourselves to Him, and to pray to Him as our Father that His will may be done in us.

Sacrifice ought to seem *more rational* and easier to the Christian than to the non-Christian. Self-denial indeed, in some ordinary degree, is prescribed by plain reasons to every intelligent being. A child soon learns by experience alone that he must repress the desire and deny himself the pleasure of the moment, if he would avoid a greater pain or gain afterwards a higher pleasure. But self-denial practised for the sake of self may only result in a deeper selfishness. And however philosophers may argue, it must be difficult to persuade a man that he ought to give himself to final ruin, that in what concerns the higher part of his being he ought to incur loss, if by doing so he can confer a more than corresponding benefit on others. But to give oneself to God as a child to a Father, this is

reasonable and safe, whatever the surrender may cost. And Christ has taught us that the most complete surrender of ourselves to God is in the long run our greatest safety. In one of His profound paradoxes He has said, "He that saves himself will lose himself: he that loses himself for my sake will save himself." To believe this,—to believe that a man can do nothing better than yield himself utterly to Christ and to God,—has proved a very powerful support to countless sufferers. "Therefore we both labour and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, the Saviour of all men." "If suffering comes to me," the Christian will say, "when I am doing God's will, I will accept the suffering contentedly because it is God's will. Nay more, I will take it as an instrument of God's gracious discipline; I will rejoice in it as associating me with the sufferings of Christ." But the sense that God desires us to offer ourselves to Him and has Himself prepared the sacrifice is not only a solid comfort and support when we are trying to give up self; it is also a great induce-

ment and stimulus to make the effort. If we only realize the sacrifice of the Son of God, how simple and necessary a thing it must seem that we should build ourselves upon it! What a contradiction that we should live to ourselves! We have been bought with a price: surely we must glorify God with the bodies and with the souls which are His. The love of Christ constrains us: for we thus judge, that if one died on behalf of all, then all died; and that He died for all, that they who live should not henceforth live to themselves, but to Him who died and rose again for them.

So we are exhorted to reason with ourselves; and so, whenever the mystery of the Cross comes home to us, our consciences must speak within us. Christians who have worshipped at the foot of the Cross have learnt all—may we not say?—that the noblest ethics of the world can teach. But I know not what Christian can help being silenced by a kind of reasonable shame when he reflects upon the average tenor of his own life, and of that of his fellow-Christians in general,

and compares it with the morality of those who do not acknowledge Christ. I do not mean that our lives are *less* worthy and unselfish than those of unbelievers, but that they ought to be infinitely more so. We have the Gospel, we have Christ, we have the Holy Spirit, and we persuade ourselves that if these were taken away, motives and hopes, moral energy, the better life, would wither, and we should fall into a careless selfishness. But we find ourselves already selfish, already careless; and I think I cannot be departing from the range of common experience when I assume that we have known others,—whether persons who have had the courageous sincerity openly to reject the faith of their fathers, or persons who whilst still nominally Christian do not profess to be religious,—whose practical goodness has often put us to shame. It must be that such persons are worshipping the Eternal Truth, the Eternal Righteousness and Love, with a truer worship, though not using our names, than many religious Christians, and that they are receiving support and strength for

which they give thanks, if not with their lips, yet with their lives. But it is surely our part, learning what we can from such as they and even stimulated by their rivalry, to ask for more of the filial Spirit of Sacrifice. Perhaps we have not resorted enough in humble docility to the Sacrament of Sacrifice; yet we know that the most frequent Communions have no magical power to compel men to give themselves up to God. We need to be as much delivered from hardness and formalism in religion as from indifference to religion. Our wisdom is to blend religion and life together, and in both equally to look up to heaven.

May I venture to add a concluding word, having reference to the characteristic temper of this University? It has often been remarked with satisfaction, that the intellectual atmosphere of Cambridge has been calmer, less agitated by the excitements of new theories of belief or unbelief, than that of other places where young men are living and thinking together, and especially than that of the great sister University.

But some have not been able to forget that the advantages of intellectual steadiness and moderation, almost invaluable as they are in a place of education, may be purchased at a very high cost. We know,—at this particular season it is superfluous to remind a Cambridge audience,—how much the great distinctions and almost excessive prizes of academical competition are here thought of, and how eagerly they are pursued. If the most ardent minds of a University, instead of being led by an exceptionally wise and enlightened guidance in the paths of moderation, are rather made indifferent to the thoughts which elsewhere shake mankind by an extreme desire of personal success, this result is not wholly to be rejoiced in. It is better to have some griefs and troubles due to the nobler aspirations, than that thousands of young men should be made partakers of a life dulled by a worldly self-regard. May God give us the good and deliver us from the evil! May He preserve peace and quiet to this University and at the same time inspire its members with a Christian ambition

to help His cause forward in the world of their day! The world on its part will owe its best gratitude to students and teachers who, exalted by the old courageous spirit of self-oblation, give themselves heartily to serve their own generation by the will of God.

III.

COMMUNION.

DISCOURSE III.

COMMUNION.

AMONGST the various titles which have been given to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, that which the Prayer-book of the Church of England offers for our ordinary use is *The Holy Communion.* When definition is required, as in the Catechism and in the Articles, the strict name of the Sacrament is *the Lord's Supper.* But elsewhere, as especially in the office for the administration of the Sacrament, it is called the Holy Communion. From the first it has been usual in the Church to apply significant titles, according to preference or custom, to the Lord's Supper. I think that the use of this title in our

Prayer-book warrants us in regarding it with a special interest as the chosen Anglican name of the great Sacrament of Christendom.

Every one will remember the place in the New Testament in which this title has its source. But it is worth while to recall the characteristic argument of St. Paul, in which the word rendered "communion" serves as a kind of key. One value of the passage is that it shews us how outward visible things may be treated as instruments and witnesses of spiritual things, without any confusing of matter and spirit. St. Paul warns the Corinthians (in 1 Cor. x.) to beware of idolatry. And he begs their intelligent consideration of a reason which he gives them, why they should not be careless about joining in the festivities of heathen worship. It is difficult to preserve in an English translation the verbal emphasis of the original; but the connexion of thought may be better indicated by the substitution of some word like *participation* for communion. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a participation in the

blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a participation in the body of Christ? For we, being many, are one bread, one body; for we all partake of the one bread. Behold Israel after the flesh;—are not they who eat the sacrifices *partners* of the altar? What do I say then? That an idol is anything, or a sacrifice offered to an idol is anything? No, I say that what the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to devils and not to God, and I would not that you should be partners of devils. You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils; you cannot partake of the table of the Lord and of the table of devils." St. Paul insists here upon seeing in a religious rite its proper spiritual significance. Give its due force to the feasting on a sacrifice, whether it be a Christian or a heathen sacrifice, and what must it mean? It brings you into union with the sacrifice and with the being to whom the sacrifice is offered. Every Jewish sacrifice, every heathen sacrifice, had equally the aim of bringing the worshippers into close union and

partnership with the God worshipped. "How then," St. Paul asks, "can you, who enter into union or fellowship with Christ in our Christian feast, allow yourselves to be similarly put into fellowship with false gods?"

Whenever the term Communion has been applied, in imitation of this example of St. Paul, to the Lord's Supper, it has always been understood as having a twofold reference. It speaks first of a partaking of Christ or fellowship with Christ, and then of a mutual fellowship between those who are related in common to Christ. The double meaning flows obviously from the nature of the fact. Those who become respectively members of the same body become fellow-members, or members one of another. One bread, one cake, is divided into many parts, and given to many communicants; in partaking of the same bread they are associated together. Whatever creates a fellowship between each man and Christ, establishes a secondary bond of fellowship between all who have this union with Christ in common.

The subject of which I wish to speak chiefly under the head of Communion is the fellowship between man and man, confessed and proclaimed by all moralists, regarded by non-Christians as resting on various other grounds, but believed in by Christians, and set forth by the Holy Communion, as subsisting in the common relation of each to Christ. But something ought to be said first perhaps upon the question, What is it that constitutes the union of men with Christ? Does it originate in, or depend absolutely upon, a partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Holy Communion?

Possibly some would answer that it does. But no Christian to whom Christian life is more than a name, whatever language he may use in obedience to the logic of a doctrinal theory or when he desires to do all the honour he can to a Divinely-ordained Sacrament, has ever forced himself to speak always in consistency with such an answer. The affirmation, however rigorously intended, is always spoilt by exceptions. Christians believe in the Holy Spirit

of God, breathing where he lists, a free mysterious subtle Spirit, infinite in grace as well as in power; and no one really dares to tie down the Divine Spirit absolutely to some visible and local vehicle. Nor is it possible for a Christian, believe as he may in some kind of corporeal feeding upon Christ, to think of a Communion so realized as higher in its nature than a Communion realized in the Spirit. There is not a hymn or prayer or meditation, accepted by Christians of any Church as an utterance of the deeper Christian feeling, in which Communion with Christ is not assumed to be essentially spiritual, possible at any time and in any place, and dependent ultimately on nothing but the eternal grace of God. The Holy Communion, therefore, with whatever truth its claims may be pressed as the legitimate channel of the grace of Communion, is not to be spoken of as the only mode of holding fellowship with Christ, nor even as the only mode of participating in His Body and Blood, so as to derive life from Him. It is the obvious

witness and pledge of such Communion; it is the appointed means of seeking it: but Christians do not feed on Christ exclusively in the Lord's Supper;—if it were so, the Sacrament would lose its own highest value. The worth of the Sacrament is that it expresses and brings home to us and stimulates that purely spiritual fellowship with Christ to which He Himself invited His disciples, and on which He laid so much stress; it summons our spirits to active faith and love; it assures us of a presence and a support by which we may continually be saved. To attempt to do the Sacrament honour by making more of the flesh than of the Spirit is like insisting on the excellence of the paper of a bank-note and knowing nothing of its value as the representative of money.

Let it be observed that St. Paul, in the passage quoted, treats the communion or partnership of idolaters with their false gods, and of members of Christ with one another, as of the same kind as the participating in the Body and Blood of Christ. All are examples of spiritual

communion,—of a fellowship realized by the will, the affections, and the conscience. It would be well to bear in mind that, according to St. Paul, the feeding together on the one Bread has the same kind of power to effect a mutual fellowship amongst ourselves, which it has to make us partakers of Christ. No one is in danger of saying that it is impossible for a man to hold communion with his fellow-Christians except in and through the Holy Communion; and it cannot be too strongly urged that it is the office of the Sacrament to bear witness to true human fellowship, and to pledge and help us to the fulfilment of it.

But when human fellowship is spoken of, the question is sure to arise in many minds, whether the communion of Christians with one another does not profess to be something essentially different from the bond which unites men as men together. This is a question upon which it is as easy to fall into mistakes as it is important to avoid them. Christian communion has undoubtedly some appearance of being exclusive; it has

constantly been made exclusive in practice by Christians; excommunication, which is a term of the Christian Church, speaks of shutting out from a society. One of the most prominent features of Christian belief to many minds has been the doctrine, that the Church and the world,—or the society of believers and the rest of mankind,—are so entirely distinguished and separated from one another as to have almost nothing in common. Yet we habitually believe in a common humanity, as well as in the communion of the saints. Do these two kinds of fellowship belong to different spheres, or are they identical, or in what relation does each stand to the other?

The Catholic doctrine on this subject may, I think, be thus stated,—that *Christian Communion is natural human fellowship brought into the Divine light and quickened by the Divine Spirit.* Whatever binds men together is justified and raised to a higher power by the common union of men to a Divine Head. Let us offer some brief illustrations in support of this statement.

And, first, it is natural that we should look to Christ Himself, and see what we may read in His life and words. The voice with which He speaks is too clear and emphatic to be misunderstood. It is equally recognized by believers and unbelievers. What is the title which He chooses for Himself? That of *The Son of Man.* To us who behold in Him the Son of God, it is a title glorious in its condescension and love, lifting up the whole human race, giving comfort and hope to every member of it. To others, it must surely seem a surprising pretension, in one who evidently knew so well the meaning of it; but they find in the actual truth of the pretension an explanation of the success of Jesus. The Son of Man! Whatever was human touched Him, as it has touched no other; we are all less human than Christ. He loved and rejoiced and grieved, as one to whom every man was a dear brother. It was His peculiar witness and teaching, that even the evil were not to be shut out from the circle of kindly fellowship. "Be the children of your Father in heaven; for He maketh His sun

to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." It was an accepted law amongst His countrymen, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself: but narrow-minded Jews could fit it to their less human dispositions by asking, *But who is my neighbour?* Jesus replied by appealing to the simple instincts of humanity, and shewing how a Samaritan heretic might perfectly keep the law through natural kindness. The spirit in which He Himself sympathized with sufferers made His followers see in Him the fulfilment of the prophet's saying, "Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses." He was capable indeed of terrible anger against men, but it was against men who in the name of God committed outrages on humanity. Those whom He repelled were the exclusive. When His denunciations were the hottest, His reproaches were such as these, "Ye lade men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burdens with one of your fingers." "Ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye enter

not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered." To Jesus Christ men as men were the children of His Father. To be humane was to be in sympathy with Him; to be inhuman was to offend Him and His Father.

Assuredly, if Christianity is to be studied first of all in Christ, it will be a difficult problem for either friend or enemy to draw a circle of Christian Communion leaving anything of humanity outside. The records of the life of Christ vindicate to the full His title of the Son of Man. When a thinker who is in perfect accord with modern ideas concerning humanity comes freshly to the examination of those records, he finds in Christ not the narrower affections of a less advanced civilization, but a richness and a warmth of human sympathy which place His life still before the largest-hearted man as a power and an example. The Son of Man, who healed in Galilee and thundered at Jerusalem, still claims the allegiance of Christendom.

But let us glance rapidly at the most ordinary causes by which human society is built

up, and let us see how these are related to the principles of Christian fellowship.

Men are so made as to be dependent on one another. One wants what it is in the power of another to supply. The more completely men agree to help each other, the better off they all find themselves. So the operation of need and help tends perpetually to bind men together. But when we look to St. Paul, for example, to see how he describes Christian fellowship, we observe that this relation is explicitly recognized and insisted upon. Christian society is a body, the members of which all have need of one another. The eye cannot say to the hand, I have no need of thee: nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you. God has tempered the body together, compelling the more honourable parts to have due regard to the less honourable, so that the members should have the same care one for another. And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it. What theories of secular socialism can

do anything more than imitate this ideal of St. Paul's?

Again, there are social or sympathetic instincts in human nature which, apart from conscious wants, move men towards one another. The mutual love of husband and wife, of parents and children, the fraternal affections, the kindness of friends and neighbours, form the spiritual cement of every social system. What does Christian doctrine say to these natural bonds? I need hardly remind you how in the Christian system these sympathies are exalted and consecrated. They are the ligaments connecting the parts in the Divinely-organized body, and enabling each to work in its place. The family, the city, the community, is a Divine creation. Such an aspect as that in which St. Paul presents the duties of husband and wife may be mystical, may be called fanciful, but it undeniably tends to make those natural duties more sacred and binding. Husband and wife will not love each other less if they are true Christians, but more. If any Christian school has persuaded

people that they ought, as heirs of heaven, to sit loose to natural affections, and has made the fulfilment of common relative obligations a mere condescension to the exigencies of a corrupt world, that is not Apostolical Christianity. In the days of the New Testament Christians were taught not to look down upon, but to reverence as Divine, the elementary bonds of human society.

Similarly, if we were to consider the common interests, common inheritances, common prospects, by which the citizens of a country are bound together, we should find that these, so far as they are worthy, are not only accepted, but lifted into a higher atmosphere, by the faith of the Christian. As we look back on history we say, "O God, we have heard with our ears, and our fathers have declared unto us, the noble works that thou didst in their days, and in the old time before them." That our country should be disgraced by crime and ignorance and social disorder causes in us a deeper grief and shame in proportion as we honour the Gospel and give

God thanks for His grace. And when we are cherishing hope, what aim can we possibly have in the interest of society, which is not also an object of Christian prayer and Christian effort? Christianity indeed is far from sanctioning all that men do and seek; it has to condemn much of what goes on in the world: but, if any pursuit is really condemned by Christian doctrine, —by such doctrine, I mean, as that which we are reading in our Sacrament of Holy Communion,—we may be sure that such a pursuit is not thoroughly social, is not tending to build up society, but to dissolve and destroy it.

Let us look for a moment in this light at the causes which notoriously weaken and injure human fellowship. Is there one of these which Christianity encourages, which it does not expressly condemn? *Dishonesty*, for example, is always at its mischievous work, producing distrust between man and man. A man is tempted to suppress the truth, to utter a falsehood, to gain secretly some unfair advantage; whenever he yields to the temptation, society suffers.

Dishonesty or falsehood is manifestly anti-social. But on that very account it is condemned by the Christian law. "Wherefore, putting away lying," says St. Paul, "speak every man truth with his neighbour; *for we are members one of another.*" How can fellow-members of the body of Christ do a thing so unnatural as to deceive one another? The mutual *jealousy*, again, which springs from irritated self-regard, is one of the great poisons of society. Beginning secretly, like a fatal gas, it broods and grows till some accident causes it to explode, with breaches and rents which can never be healed. But no one can come under the teaching of the Gospel without being distinctly warned, in the name of the Gospel, against the cherishing of resentment. The Gospel is the offer of forgiveness from God to men; but God's forgiveness, we are assured, cannot reach the unforgiving. "Forgive, and ye shall be forgiven." "If ye do not forgive, neither will your Father who is in heaven forgive you." "Be kind one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, even as

God in Christ has forgiven you." "Be angry and sin not; let not the sun go down upon your wrath, neither give place to the devil." "Give not room," that is, "for the dividing spirit, the spirit of misconstruction, of falsehood, of ill will, to enter in and to set brother against brother." Another destroyer of the unity of society is *insolence*, the insolence of wealth and prosperity, the insolence of caste. What can strike more directly at the root of insolence than the law of Christ? "My brethren," says the Apostle, with grave remonstrance, "have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, with respect of persons." "Who maketh thee to differ from another? and what hast thou that thou didst not receive? Now, if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory, as if thou hadst not received it?" It is not to the New Testament that the rich man or the cultivated can go to find excuses for looking down upon the multitude. There, on the contrary, he will find incessant warnings as to his special dangers, and as to the retri-

bution which will attend on his special sins. He will find the grace of God exalted above all worldly distinctions, and will be told that the poor have a better chance than he of receiving that grace... Or, take two opposite causes which introduce mischief into the economical system of society, *greed of money*, and *idleness*. A train of destructive influences proceed from both: from the eager love of money,—excessive speculation, hardness in driving bargains, overwork, a spirit of competition which looks on competitors as necessary enemies; from idleness,—a loose self-indulgence, neglect of relative obligations, a habit of fault-finding, poverty, pauperism. The law of Christ makes both covetousness and idleness offences against God. "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon." "Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high-minded nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate." "As touching bro-

therly love, ye need not that I write unto you, for ye yourselves are taught of God to love one another. And indeed ye do it toward all the brethren which are in all Macedonia; but we beseech you, brethren, that ye increase more and more; and that ye study to be quiet and to do your own business, and to work with your own hands as we commanded you; that ye may walk honestly toward them that are without, and that ye may have lack of nothing." "Let a man labour, working with his hands the thing that is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth."

These are but examples of the way in which the true Christian faith meets every vice which threatens society, marks it with the more awful name of a sin against God, and charges men by their gratitude to God for His mercies and by their fear of His displeasure to avoid it and to war against it. Let a man be a true Christian, and he cannot do anything which he knows to be unsocial. To be in communion with Christ is to love God and man, and love, which works

no ill to a neighbour, unconsciously fulfils the whole social law. "This is the message," says St. John, "which we have heard from the Son of God and declare unto you, that God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all. If we say that we have fellowship with Him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth: but if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another." There is no room for doubt as to what St. John meant by darkness and light. Light was love and righteousness; darkness was hatred and unrighteousness. The blessed revelation made by the coming of the Son of God in the flesh, was that God was perfectly righteous, perfectly loving, with a love and truth which could be known by humanity and reproduced in humanity. The eternal grounds of fellowship are righteousness and love. "We who were friends of the Lord Jesus," says St. John, "declare to you what we have seen and heard, in order that you may have fellowship with us,—and our fellowship is with the Father and his Son Jesus Christ."

Certainly, these words themselves speak of a communion which is to be enjoyed by those who know and believe in Jesus Christ. Nothing that was said by any Apostle,—nothing, I hope, of what I have been saying,—can be rightly understood as implying that there is no such thing as a peculiar Christian fellowship. But the fellowship is of those who have learnt together that there is a hope for mankind which others have despaired of, or at which they have wistfully guessed; of those who have seen heaven opened and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God. This common faith cannot but make those who share it rejoice together and grieve together and labour together, till a fellow-feeling, a spiritual sympathy, of unbounded closeness and tenderness grows up between them. But the utmost growth of it does not separate them from their fellow-men, whatever belief and hopes these others may be entertaining; they love not the man the less, because they love the fellow-Christian the more. The exclusiveness which has been charged upon

Christians has a twofold explanation. It may be the name for the fact that the strongest believers in Christ have set the highest value on the Gospel, and have desired most earnestly that all men should receive it, and have taken pains to guard their own faith and love from growing cold, and have assumed that not to be a Christian was to be suffering a loss beyond calculation. I have been quoting St. John; and it is probable that no one, after reading his Epistles, would be inclined to claim St. John as a Liberal. But there is another kind of exclusiveness, belonging to Christians but not to Christianity; due to the forgetting of St. John's great lesson, that the Revelation we have received is a manifestation of God in his Son as infinitely righteous and good. Christians who fence themselves off from their fellow-men are offenders against the law of humanity; but they are first of all disloyal to the law of Christ. There is no danger of Christians clinging to one another too closely, so long as they are bound together in the common love of the Son of man.

When at first the new fervour of humanity was stirring in the Christian body, it had two principal triumphs: it brought rich and poor into sincere fellowship; and it constrained Jews to acknowledge men of other races as brethren. If a more lively spirit of communion, derived from fellowship with Christ, were to be aroused amongst ourselves, it would assuredly find work of both kinds to do. On the binding of rich and poor together, though modern circumstances might suggest much to say, I will only say this: that the power of Christian principle to adjust classes together, making them helpful and not hostile to each other, must come from the recognition of men, both rich and poor, as brethren in God's family; not from an exaggerated estimate of the value of riches and power, and of the rights of the poor to attain a share in them, but from a confession that all are cared for by God, all are responsible to Him, and that it is an infinitely more important question whether a man is just and merciful, a true man, honouring all men, than whether he is rich or

poor, great or small. On the *Catholic* influence of Christian communion or its power to obliterate the isolation of races, I am tempted to dwell a little longer, because we in England have been charged with making patriotic isolation a virtue, and high-minded men, like the authors of the Essays on International Policy, have set themselves to rebuke our pride of race, and to urge upon Englishmen their obligations as members of the great human family. It has been represented by our most eloquent statesman and repeated by others,[11] that those who have laboured most zealously to promote freedom of trade, did not so earnestly desire to increase wealth at home, as to bring about what they held to be a far higher end, a more cordial international fellowship. Now particular accusations of unjust and selfish and insolent disregard of human rights should be tested by facts: but if we have to plead guilty, we surely have in our New Testament, in our Creeds and Prayers, a more direct and forcible condemnation than can light on us from any other

quarter. If the obligations of humanity between different races of men have indeed to be brought before us as a discovery of our age, why have we been for so many generations professing to be Catholic Christians? Let us be thankful for modern lessons, modern reproofs: but let us take to ourselves the deeper shame, when we remember to what sacred teaching we must have made ourselves deaf. We belong to the Church of St. Peter, to whom God shewed that he should not call any man common or unclean; of St. Paul, who saw that membership in Christ transcended all distinctions of Jew and Greek, barbarian, Scythian, bond and free; of St. John, who had visions of a great multitude, of all nations and kindreds and people and tongues, standing before the throne and before the Lamb, and of a New Jerusalem into which the glory and honour of the nations were to be brought. We read perhaps many times in the year that broadest of statements, made by a Christian Apostle pleading with a heathen audience: "God hath made of one blood all nations of

men, for to dwell on all the face of the earth; and hath determined the times before appointed and the bounds of their habitation; that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after Him and find Him, though He be not far from every one of us: for in Him we live and move and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also His offspring." This is the Creed of Christians as to Englishmen and Frenchmen, as to Indians and Negroes.

With reference to the relations of commerce to the cordial human intercourse of different nations, we might challenge any modern politician to state those relations more thoroughly or more beautifully than they were stated 300 years ago in the simple language of Catholic Christianity by one of our English rulers. I quote from a letter sent by Edward VIth with an expedition of discovery, and addressed to the rulers of any country at which the expedition might arrive: "Forasmuch as the great and Almighty God hath given unto mankind, above all

other living creatures, such an heart and desire, that every man desireth to join friendship with other, to love and be loved, also to give and receive mutual benefits: it is therefore the duty of all men according to their power to maintain and increase this desire in every man, with well deserving to all men, and especially to shew this good affection to such as being moved with this desire come to them from far countries .... For the God of heaven and earth, greatly providing for mankind, would not that all things should be found in one region, to the end that one should have need of another, that by this means friendship might be established among all men, and every one seek to gratify all. For the furtherance of which universal amity, certain men of our realm, moved hereunto by the said desire, have instituted and taken upon them a voyage into far countries, desiring us to further their enterprise. Who, assenting to their petition, have licensed the right valiant and worthy Sir Hugh Willoughby, Kt. and others our trusty and faithful servants, to go to countries to them

heretofore unknown, as well to seek such things as we lack, as also to carry unto them from our regions such things as they lack. So that hereby not only commodity may ensue both to them and us, but also an indissoluble and perpetual league of friendship be established between us both. We therefore desire you kings and princes and all other to whom there is any power on the earth, to permit unto these our servants free passage by your regions and dominions; for they shall not touch anything of yours unwilling unto you. *Consider you that they also are men.* If therefore they shall stand in need of anything, we desire you of all humanity and for the nobility which is in you, to aid and help them with such things as they lack, receiving again of them such things as they shall be able to give you in recompense. Shew yourselves so towards them, as you would that we and our subjects should shew ourselves towards your servants, if at any time they shall pass by our regions."[12]—That, I repeat, is the theory of trade according to Catholic Christianity. It may be a reproach to us

if we have to learn a poor imitation of it from some other teachers, but the reproach ought not to fall on the Gospel to which through our narrowness we have been unfaithful.

To sum up in a few concluding words what I have been endeavouring to set before you.—Our Holy Communion preaches that through fellowship with Christ our Divine Head we have fellowship with one another. There are two ways in which this preaching may be set at nought. We may exalt the Sacrament, but by making it magical instead of spiritual, we may forfeit its moral influence. Or, we may fix our thoughts respectfully on human fellowship, but resolve to shut out the idea of any Divine bond of it. In the contemplation of the former of these tendencies I would urge, *Consider* the Sacrament which you honour: let it teach you, as it will, the sacredness of common humanity. With those who may be affected by the latter I would plead, Is not human fellowship illustrated and consecrated and bound home upon the consciences of men, by the acknowledgment of the

Son of Man, who is the Head of every man? Without Christ, you either lose the immense help of an ideal in which even corrupt and offensive humanity has an admitted claim upon you; or you set up an ideal which you know to be your own invention. How can the best and highest be persuaded,—not to *patronize* humanity, but to serve it in all humility, unless they see behind the foolish and perishing races of mankind the abiding Figure of the Divine Man?

It would not be right, indeed, to take up a faith in Christ merely because the acknowledgment of Him would be good for human fellowship. But we may rightly use the contemplation of this fact, if it be one, to support and to vitalize our faith. Is there not a region, an atmosphere, into which both our religion and our ordinary conceptions of life need equally to rise? We are brought up to believe in a spiritual world, in which God and Christ and the living spirits of men who toil and who endure are the realities. Is it possible that well-meaning persons should be tempted in our generation to

decline from that faith, to seek life and comfort either in the weak and beggarly rudiments of ceremonial observance, or in the laws and interests of a world without Christ? Let us listen rather to the high-toned appeal, "Stand fast in the liberty with which Christ has made us free." Having begun in the Spirit, are we now to be made perfect by the flesh?—God forbid!

NOTES.

NOTES.

NOTE 1. Page 3.

"So called Churches, which have absolutely nothing to tell us on any of the important questions of the day, which are no longer ahead or even abreast of the secular world in their moral teaching and discipline, have lost their *raison d'être*. Secure in the affections of the uneducated majority, they may long afford to ignore the timid and tortuous sap of the savant who has nothing to substitute for what he is undermining. But there is a rivalry they cannot disregard. Whatever a clergy may think, no religious organization can long hold its ground in popular esteem when confronted by a loftier morality than its own. Either it must prove its expansive force by adapting itself heartily to the higher standard, or it will fall as polytheism fell before Christianity, as Eastern Christianity before Islam, condemned by the heart even more energetically than by the intellect."

Essays on International Policy, pp. 220, 221.

NOTE 2. Page 11.

Καὶ γὰρ ἡ εὐχαριστία ἐκείνῳ μὲν οὐδὲν προστίθησιν, ἡμᾶς δὲ οἰκειοτέρους αὐτῷ κατασκευάζει...διὰ δὴ τοῦτο καὶ τὰ φρι-

κώδη μυστήρια καὶ πολλῆς γέμοντα σωτηρίας, τὰ καθ' ἑκάστην τελούμενα λέγω σύναξιν, εὐχαριστία καλεῖται, ὅτι πολλῶν ἐστὶν εὐεργετημάτων ἀνάμνησις, καὶ τὸ κεφάλαιον τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ πρόνοιας ἐνδείκνυται, καὶ διὰ πάντων παρασκευάζει εὐχαριστεῖν.

Chrysostom, *Hom. in Matth.* xxv. (Matth. vii. 28).

NOTE 3. Page 40.

Μετὰ δὴ πάντα οἷόν τι θαυμάσιον θῦμα καὶ σφάγιον ἐξαίρετον τῷ πατρὶ καλλιερησάμενος ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁπάντων ἡμῶν ἀνήνεγκε σωτηρίας, μνήμην καὶ ἡμῖν παραδοὺς ἀντὶ θυσίας τῷ Θεῷ διηνεκῶς προσφέρειν.

Euseb. *Demonst. Evang.* I. 10 (p. 103, Gaisford).

Οὐκοῦν καὶ θύομεν καὶ θυμιῶμεν· τοτὲ μὲν τὴν μνήμην τοῦ μεγάλου θύματος κατὰ τὰ πρὸς αὐτοῦ παραδοθέντα μυστήρια ἐπιτελοῦντες, καὶ τὴν ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν εὐχαριστίαν δι' εὐσεβῶν ὑμνῶν τε καὶ εὐχῶν τῷ Θεῷ προσκομίζοντες, τοτὲ δὲ σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ὅλῳ [ὅλους] καθιεροῦντες αὐτῷ, καὶ τῷ γε ἀρχιερεῖ αὐτοῦ Λόγῳ, αὐτῷ σώματι καὶ ψυχῇ ἀνακείμενοι.

Ibid. (p. 108, Gaisford).

NOTE 4. Page 40.

Τί οὖν; ἡμεῖς καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν οὐ προσφέρομεν; προσφέρομεν μέν, ἀλλ' ἀνάμνησιν ποιούμενοι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ· καὶ μία ἐστὶν αὕτη καὶ οὐ πολλαί...τὸν γὰρ αὐτὸν ἀεὶ προσφέρομεν...ὥστε μία ἐστὶν ἡ θυσία...οὐκ ἀλλὴν θυσίαν, ὥσπερ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς τοτὲ, ἀλλὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἀεὶ ποιοῦμεν, μᾶλλον δὲ, ἀνάμνησιν ἐργαζόμεθα θυσίας.

Chrysostom, *Hom. in Heb.* xvii. (Heb. ix. 25).

NOTE 5. Page 40.

Τῆς γὰρ καινῆς διαθήκης κατὰ τὴν θείαν δοθείσης ἐπαγγελίαν ἐδόθη καὶ ἱερωσύνη κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ· καὶ οἱ

ταύτης ἠξιωμένοι τὴν λογικὴν θυσίαν ἐνδελεχῶς προσφέρουσι τῷ Θεῷ.

Theodoret. *in Jerem.* cap. xxxiii. (pag. 234).

Καὶ εὔχονται δὲ οὐκέτι πλείοσι κυρίοις, ἑνὶ δὲ τῷ μόνῳ Κυρίῳ κατὰ τὸ ἱερον λόγιον, καὶ τούτῳ θυσιαστήριον ἀναίμων καὶ λογικῶν θυσιῶν κατὰ τὰ καινὰ μυστήρια τῆς νέας καὶ καινῆς διαθήκης καθ' ὅλης τῆς ἀνθρώπων οἰκουμένης ἀνεγήγερται.

Euseb. *Demonst. Evang.* I. 6 (p. 65, Gaisford).

Τὰ σεμνὰ τῆς Χριστοῦ τραπέζης θύματα, δι' ὧν καλλιεροῦντες τὰς ἀναίμους καὶ λογικὰς αὐτῷ τε προσηνεῖς θυσίας διὰ πάντος βίου τῷ ἐπὶ πάντων προσφέρειν Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ πάντων ἀνωτάτου ἀρχιερέως αὐτοῦ δεδιδάγμεθα.

Ibid. I. 10 (p. 105, Gaisford).

Διά τε τοῦ προφήτου Μαλαχίου...διαμέμνηται καιρῶν, καθ' οὓς ἂν αὐτῷ προσοίσειαν οἱ ἀνὰ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν τῆς ἀναιμάκτου καὶ νοητῆς θυσίας τὴν ἀσύγκριτον εὐωδίαν.

Cyril. Alex. *de Adorat.* II. p. 57.

Εἰκότως τὴν τούτου μνήμην τοῦ τε σώματος αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τὴν ὑπόμνησιν ὁσημέραι ἐπιτελοῦντες, καὶ τῆς κρείττονος ἢ κατὰ τοὺς παλαιοὺς θυσίας τε καὶ ἱερουργίας ἠξιωμένοι, οὐκ ἐθ' ὅσιον ἡγούμεθα καταπίπτειν ἐπὶ τὰ πρῶτα καὶ ἀσθενῆ στοιχεῖα, σύμβολα καὶ εἰκόνας ἀλλ' οὐκ αὐτὴν ἀλήθειαν περιέχοντα.

Euseb. *Demonst. Evang.* I. 10 (p. 101, Gaisford).

NOTE 6. Page 41.

Οἱονεὶ γάρ πως ἐν εἰκόνι τοῖς θύμασι τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἱερουργοῦμεν ψυχὰς καὶ θεῷ προσάγομεν, ἀποθνήσκοντες τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ τῷ φρονεῖν τὰ σαρκὸς καὶ παθῶν νέκρωσιν ὑπομένοντες.

Cyril. Alex. *de Adorat.* XI. p. 402.

NOTE 7. Page 41.

Ὅρα γὰρ, ἄνω ἔχομεν τὸ ἱερεῖον, ἄνω τὸν ἱερέα, ἄνω τὴν θυσίαν. Οὐκοῦν τοιαύτας ἀναφέρωμεν θυσίας τὰς ἐν ἐκείνῳ δυναμένας προσφέρεσθαι τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ· οὐκέτι πρόβατα καὶ βόας, οὐκέτι αἷμα καὶ κνίσσην· πάντα ταῦτα λέλυται, καὶ ἀντεισενήνεκται ἀντὶ τούτων ἡ λόγικὴ λατρεία.

Chrys. *Hom. in Heb.* xi. (Heb. vi. 13).

NOTE 8. Page 51.

Utilitarianism, by J. S. Mill, pp. 24, 25 (2d edition).

NOTE 9. Page 51.

The perfection of Humanity,—a unity consisting in the harmonious development of all human energies, and depending on the mutual love of human beings,—is the ideal end, according to M. Comte, to which human efforts must converge, and towards which they can only advance by the free subordination of the selfish to the benevolent instincts.

The ascendency of Positivism is secured "par la convergence naturelle de tous les aspects positivistes vers la grande conception de l'Humanité, qui vient éliminer irrevocablement celle de Dieu, pour constituer une unité définitive plus complète et plus durable que l'unité provisoire du régime initial...D'après sa nature encore plus morale que mentale, ce centre universel du positivisme représente aussi le principe affectif de la systématisation finale. Car, le caractère propre de ce Nouveau Grand-Être consistant à être necessairement composé d'éléments séparables, toute son existence repose sur l'amour mutuel que lie toujours ses diverses parties, *sans qu'aucun calcul puisse jamais tenir lieu d'un tel instinct.*"—*Système de Politique Positive*, Vol. I. p. 329.

M. Comte's doctrine is thus stated by one of the ablest of his English disciples:

"The subordination in one way or other, in one degree or other, of the self-regarding to the unselfish principle, the recognition that life is given us not solely or mainly for our own enjoyment, but mainly, if not solely, for the service of others, is and must ever remain the one primary condition of spiritual health."

The Unity of Comte's Life and Doctrine, by J. H. Bridges, p. 30.

It will be observed that Dr. Bridges speaks here of life as "given" to us. In the well-known line of another non-theistical writer,—Vitaque mancipio nulli datur, omnibus usu,—the same expression occurs. Does not this language lose something of its moral dignity and impressiveness, when we translate "is given" into "issues by chance or necessity from a combination of unconscious forces"? Who or what, according to the Positivist doctrine, is the "giver of life"?

NOTE 10. Page 52.

"Le dévouement absolu est pour les natures naïves la plus exquise des jouissances et une sorte de besoin...Il est si doux à l'homme de souffrir pour quelque chose, que dans bien des cas l'appât du martyre suffit pour faire croix.....Supposons une humanité dix fois plus forte que la nôtre; cette humanité-là serait infiniment plus religieuse. Il est même probable qu'à ce degré de sublimité, dégagé de tout souci matériel et de tout égoïsme, doué d'un tact parfait et d'un goût divinement délicat, voyant la bassesse et le néant de tout ce qui

111659

n'est pas le vrai, le bien ou le beau, l'homme serait uniquement religieux, plongé dans une perpétuelle adoration, roulant d'extases en extases, naissant, vivant, et mourant dans un torrent de volupté."

Les Apôtres, par Ernest Renan, pp. 380, 381, 385.

NOTE 11. Page 87.

Mr. Gladstone, at the opening dinner of the Cobden Club.

Lord Hobart, article on "The Mission of Richard Cobden" in *Macmillan's Magazine* for January, 1867.

NOTE 12. Page 91.

The Letter is in *Hakluyt's Voyages*.

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

By the same Author.

THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL TO THE EPHESIANS, THE COLOSSIANS, AND PHILEMON. With Introductions and Notes, and an Essay on the Traces of Foreign Elements in the Theology of these Epistles. 8vo, *7s. 6d.*

Everything which helps us to see St. Paul with a truer and fresher eye is a contribution of no ordinary value to the theology of the day. Mr. Davies's version of these epistles, with his manly and admirable notes, will help many to do so; and we think that most of his readers will feel the intellectual, and more than intellectual, obligations which we have felt to him while studying his book.—*Spectator.*

We attach a high value to his commentary as setting forth ably and scholarly certain views of their character and purport which are well worthy of attention. Mr. Davies seems to us, too, thoroughly independent in his treatment. He has studied his subject for himself, and gives us the results of that study in very thoughtful, original, and instructive notes and essays. Of special value are the Introductions to the Epistles treated of, in which Mr. Davies more expressly endeavours to apply what he regards as the peculiar teachings of St. Paul in this part of his writings to the emergencies of our own days.—*Guardian.*

It would be easy to point to a number of passages in which Mr. Davies has shed real light upon obscure points, and displayed at once sound scholarship and sound judgment. In most cases, indeed, he appears to us eminently successful in elucidating the nexus which, especially in the Ephesians, underlies an apparently disjointed train of thought.—*Nonconformist.*

The annotations are all that can be desired,—models of clearness and of conciseness without obscurity.—*Churchman.*

MACMILLAN AND CO., LONDON.

By the same Author.

I.

SERMONS ON THE MANIFESTATION OF THE SON OF GOD. With a Preface addressed to Laymen on the Present Position of the Clergy of the Church of England; and an Appendix on the Testimony of Scripture and the Church as to the Possibility of Pardon in the Future State. Fcap. 8vo, *6s. 6d.*

II.

THE WORK OF CHRIST; OR, THE WORLD RECONCILED TO GOD. With a Preface on the Atonement Controversy. Fcap. 8vo, *6s.*

III.

LIFE IN CHRIST: SERMONS. *5s.*

IV.

BAPTISM, CONFIRMATION, AND THE LORD'S SUPPER, as interpreted by their Outward Signs. Three Expository Addresses for Parochial Use. Limp cloth, *1s. 6d.*

MACMILLAN AND CO., LONDON.

00111059

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 19 September, 2016